

## **CHAPTER 9**

# **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, RECOMMENDATIONS and IMPLEMENTATION**

As stated in the introduction, the Comprehensive Park Master Plan is both a guide and a tool for shaping the future of the Hampshire Township Park District. This Plan serves as a guide for the Board of Commissioners and the public to conceive and define future direction for the Park District, and used as a tool by the staff to accomplish the goals and objectives of the Plan.

As part of the Plan, numerous recommendations have been developed as a result of the park land inventory, the analyses of programs, and meetings/interviews with District Board of Commissioners and staff. The recommenda-

tions are not all-inclusive; however, alternatives are suggested that range from conservative to optimistic relative to funding. In the overall assessment, the Hampshire Township Park District is providing excellent services to the residents of the community based on the available resources.

The recommendations that follow represent areas where the Park District can improve and/or strengthen their services, operations, programs, and facilities. Based upon these recommendations, the District should annually review goals and objectives and establish priorities to assess progress, with new goals and objectives added. In addition, the 10 year Capital Improvement Program and the Recommendations/Implementation should be reviewed and evaluated annually, and updated accordingly.

## Capital Improvement Program

The Capital Improvement Program is developed to:

- Identify needed improvements to facilities;
- Establish estimated costs for improvements;
- Establish priorities for improvements;
- Budget for annual and long range costs; and
- Determine the need for funding sources and amounts.

The two key components of the Capital Improvement Program are:

1. Improvements to facilities with estimated costs established; and
2. Annual budgets based upon revenue sources.

The goal in developing the Capital Improvement Program is to balance annual budgets against improvement costs. A number of factors enter into this equation, including priority of improvements, available funding sources, timing of improvements, and need to sequence improvements if phased.

## PARK IMPROVEMENTS AND COSTS

As discussed in Chapter 2, each of the three Park District's existing sites was inventoried and facilities evaluated. Based on the evaluation, recommended improvements were developed taking into account:

- Age and condition of facility;
- User safety;
- Accessibility requirements;
- Maintenance;
- Functional relationships; and
- Recreation program needs.

The cost of implementing each improvement was estimated (see Appendix A for costs estimates). The following is a summary of the recommended improvement categories and associated costs for each park.

### Seyller Park:

1. Park Identification Sign	\$ 5,800
2. Pedestrian Paths	43,200
3. Northwest Parking Lot	40,100
4. Recreation Building	
Parking Lot	95,900
5. Basketball/Tennis Courts	115,100
6. Site Furnishings	33,600
7. Playground	17,500
8. Baseball Field Renovation	45,000
9. Picnic Shelter Renovation	4,000
10. Electrical/Lighting	15,500
<u>11. Landscape</u>	<u>62,100</u>

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION**

---

Subtotal:	\$ 477,800
Site Master Plan	23,000
<u>Design, Engineering, Survey</u>	<u>71,700</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 572,500</b>

**Bruce Ream Memorial Park:**

1. Park Identification Sign	\$ 5,800
2. Pedestrian Paths	43,200
3. Northeast Parking Lot	77,100
4. South Parking Lot	49,500
5. Basketball Court	34,300
6. Site Furnishings	30,600
7. Drinking Fountains	10,200
8. Playground	141,900
9. Baseball Fields Renovation	73,200
10. Softball Field Renovation	55,200
11. Soccer Field Renovation	186,300
12. Picnic Shelter Renovation	5,400
13. Restroom Building Renovation	25,700
14. Electrical/Lighting	23,200
<u>15. Landscape</u>	<u>57,500</u>
Subtotal:	\$ 819,100
Site Master Plan	20,000
<u>Design, Engineering, Survey</u>	<u>122,800</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 961,900</b>

**Dorothy J. Schmidt Memorial Park:**

1. Park Identification Sign	\$ 2,900
2. Site Furnishings	11,500
3. Pedestrian Paths	12,500
4. Playground	111,400
5. Basketball Court	22,600
6. Shelter/Gazebo	30,500
7. Landscape	20,700
<u>8. Misc. Improvements</u>	<u>8,100</u>
Subtotal:	\$ 220,200
Site Master Plan	12,000
<u>Design, Engineering, Survey</u>	<u>33,100</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 261,300</b>

**Tuscany Woods Park:**

In addition to the above improvements to the three existing parks, proposed improvements are planned for Tuscany Woods Park following the initial phase of improvements to be completed by the developer. Based on cost estimates provided by the developer's landscape architect, the total estimated costs, including design and engineering fees are as follows:

Tuscany Woods Phase II	\$ 947,945
<u>Tuscany Woods Phase III</u>	<u>94,875</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 1,042,820</b>

**Renovation of Community Recreation Center Building:**

As discussed later in this Chapter, it is recommended that in order to relieve immediate space needs, the Park District should renovate the existing Recreation Center Building to accommodate pre-school programs and rent space elsewhere in the community for administrative space and recreation programs. The cost for renovation is estimated at \$100,000.

The total estimated cost for all recommended improvements for the four parks and building renovation equals \$2,942,485. This total represents construction costs, site master plan fees, design and engineering fees, surveying, testing and a 15% contingency factor.

**Other Improvement Costs and Facilities**

In addition to the above improvements and costs for existing facilities, a number of other improvements and facilities were investigated. These include the following:

### **New Community Center Recreation Building**

Later in this Chapter, a new Community Recreation Center Building is discussed and recommended. Based on a 1999 Feasibility Study, the estimated cost for a new building ranged between \$4,363,552 and \$4,831,621. Based on 2005 dollars, the range would be approximately \$5,200,000 to \$5,800,000.

### **Skateboard Park**

Another new facility recommended is a skateboard park. The estimated cost ranges between \$75,000 and \$150,000, depending upon the size and types of components.

### **Proposed and Future Park Improvements**

As discussed in previous chapters, four new residential developments are in the final stages of the Village's review/approval planning process. These four developments include six new parks that will be donated to the Park District, plus four additional proposed park sites that are recommended to meet service area standards. Also, land adjacent for expansion to Bruce Ream Memorial Park may be available to the District.

In addition to the above proposed developments, there are twelve future developments that are in the pre-application stage of the planning review process. Based on their size and population, these future developments will generate the need for four to six new parks.

Although the Park District will receive the new park land at no cost, the District will need to budget and develop the land for recreation facilities. As a result, the costs for improvements to these new parks will have a substantial impact on the District.

General costs have been estimated for each of the proposed, additional proposed, and future parks based on potential facilities, acreage of the proposed park, classification of park, and available park development cost data. A range of development costs have been estimated for each park based upon dollars per acres. Costs are for general planning purposes only, and do not represent actual costs calculated for each proposed/future park. Final costs will be dependent on site conditions, program development, public input, and the preparation of Site Master Plans.

Table 9-1 identifies proposed, additional proposed, and future park sites and their estimated range of development costs. It is estimated that for the proposed parks, development costs for improvements could range between \$13.4 million and \$16.2 million. For the additional proposed parks, the estimated range of developments costs is between \$2.2 and \$2.6 million, and for future parks the range is between \$54 million and \$6.5 million. Altogether, the range of development costs for proposed parks, additional proposed parks, and future parks range between \$21.1 million and \$25.4 million.

## **CAPITAL BUDGETS**

In order to determine the level of improvements to be implemented annually, capital budgets based on revenues sources must be established. In order to determine annual capital budgets and sources of funding, estimated amounts were based on the following source categories:

- Available unspent capital funds from previous year;
- Revenue sources including bonds, impact fees;
- Cash from the land/cash ordinance;

**TABLE 9-1: Proposed and  
Future Park Development  
Costs**



- Grants;
- Revenues from potential sponsorship program;
- Individual and corporate donations;
- Donations and/sponsorships from community services organizations;
- Affiliate organization fees;
- Village landscape ordinance donation; and
- miscellaneous sources.

- Grants will equal one-half the total project costs, with a maximum of \$400,000 per grant;
- Individual and corporate donations will increase annually by \$500;
- Community service organization donations will average \$750 per year;
- Affiliate organization fees will average \$600 annually; and
- Village landscape ordinance contributions will average \$15,000 annually.

### CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM OPTIONS

Using the recommended improvements for the three existing parks, Tuscany Woods Phases II and III, and the Recreation Building renovation and estimated capital budgets, three Capital Improvement Program Options were prepared.

For each Option, a number of common assumptions were made relative to improvements, including:

- Recommended improvement costs are based on year 2005 dollars;
- An average annual 3% inflation factor was applied to the total improvement costs per year beyond 2005; and
- Certain improvements need to be implemented in sequence to avoid additional costs for repair.

As with improvements, a number of common assumptions were made in order to establish annual capital budgets. These assumptions included:

- A capital improvement fund exists in 2005 in the amount of \$300,000;
- Average annual cash from land/cash ordinance will equal \$25,000;

Based on the improvement costs/assumptions and budget sources/assumptions, the recommended improvements were spread out over a ten year period. The objective was not to have total annual improvement costs exceed the total annual capital budget. In some instances, where costs did exceed capital budgets, it was for no more than one year in sequence.

Each of the three options are discussed below with tables for each included on the following pages.

### Capital Improvement Program Option A

Capital Improvement Program Option A (see Table 9-3) represents the minimum or low option. This option assumes an average annual revenue source of \$50,000, plus sources identified above. The program assumes no development of Tuscany Woods Park (Phases II and III) and Dorothy J. Schmidt Memorial Park with grants. The emphasis in this option is to implement as many improvements to Seyller Park and Bruce Ream Memorial Park as feasible.

The option provides for a total ten year capital improvement cost of \$1,236,049 against an estimated ten year capital budget of \$1,246,350. Of the total \$2.942 million of

recommended improvements, \$1.107 million (37.6%) of improvements are implemented.

For Option A, Table 9-2 identifies those improvements implemented.

Park/Improvement	Improvement Implemented
<b>Bruce Ream Memorial Park</b>	
Park Identification Signs	●
Pedestrian Paths	●
Northeast Parking Lot	
South Parking Lot	
Basketball Court	●
Site Furnishings	
Drinking Fountain	●
Playground	●
Baseball Fields Renovation	●
Softball Field Renovation	●
Soccer Fields	●
Picnic Shelter	●
Restroom Building	●
Electrical/Lighting	
Landscape	●
Site Master Plan	●
<b>Seyller Park</b>	
Park Identification Signs	●
Pedestrian Paths	●
Northwest Parking Lot	
Recreation Building Parking Lot	
Basketball/Tennis Court	
Site Furnishings	●
Playground	●
Picnic Shelter Renovation	●
Baseball Field Renovation	●
Electrical/Lighting	
Landscape	●
Site Master Plan	●
<b>Community Recreation Center Renovation</b>	●

Table 9-2: Option A Improvements Implemented

### Capital Improvement Program Option B

Capital Improvement Program Option B (see Table 9-4) represents a medium level option. This option assumes that the land/cash contri-

butions increase by \$5,000 per year, with a total of \$475,000 over the ten year period, plus sources identified above. In addition, it is assumed that revenue sources increase by approximately \$5,000 per year, with a ten year total of \$725,000. The program assumes no development of Tuscany Woods Park (Phases II and III). Dorothy J. Schmidt Memorial Park is developed with an OSLAD grant in the second year. In addition to development of Dorothy J. Schmidt Memorial Park and renovation of the Recreation Center Building, the emphasis continues to implement as many improvements to Seyller Park and Bruce Ream Memorial Park as feasible.

The option provides for a total ten year capital improvement cost of \$1,822,965 against an estimated ten year capital budget of \$1,828,622. Of the total \$2.942 million of recommended improvements, \$1,632,835 million (55.5%) of improvements are implemented.

For Option B, Table 9-6 identifies those improvements implemented.

### Capital Improvement Program Option C

Capital Improvement Program Option C (see Table 9-5) represents a high level option. This option assumes a substantial increase of \$100,000 per year in revenue sources in years 2008 through 2011, and an increase of \$150,000 per year in revenue sources in years 2012 through 2014. Sources for this increased revenue could be the approval of a bond and/or tax increase referendum, or increased cash from the land/cash donation ordinance.

The option assumes development of both Tuscany Woods Park (Phases II) and Dorothy J. Schmidt Memorial Park with OSLAD grants,

**TABLE 9-3(1)**  
**CIP OPTION A**



**TABLE 9-3(2)**  
**CIP OPTION A**



**TABLE 9-4(1)**  
**CIP OPTION B**



**TABLE 9-4(2)**  
**CIP OPTION B**



**TABLE 9-5(1)  
CIP OPTION C**



**TABLE 9-5(2)**  
**CIP OPTION C**



**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION**

Park/Improvement	Improvement Implemented
<b>Bruce Ream Memorial Park</b>	
Park Identification Signs	●
Pedestrian Paths	●
Northeast Parking Lot	
South Parking Lot	
Basketball Court	●
Site Furnishings	●
Drinking Fountain	●
Playground	●
Baseball Fields Renovation	●
Softball Field Renovation	●
Soccer Fields	●
Picnic Shelter	●
Restroom Building	●
Electrical/Lighting	●
Landscape	●
Site Master Plan	●
<b>Seyller Park</b>	
Park Identification Signs	●
Pedestrian Paths	●
Northwest Parking Lot	
Recreation Building Parking Lot	
Basketball/Tennis Court	●
Site Furnishings	●
Playground	●
Picnic Shelter Renovation	●
Baseball Field Renovation	●
Electrical/Lighting	
Landscape	●
Site Master Plan	●
<b>Community Recreation Center Renovation</b>	●
<b>Dorothy J. Schmidt Memorial Park</b>	
Park Identification Signs	●
Pedestrian Paths	●
Site Furnishings	●
Playground	●
Basketball Court	●
Picnic Shelter	
Landscape	●
Miscellaneous improvements	●
Site Master Plan	●

Table 9-6: Option B Improvements Implemented

and renovation of the Recreation Center Building. The emphasis continues to implement as many improvements to Seyller Park and Bruce Ream Memorial Park as feasible.

Option C provides for a total ten year capital improvement cost of \$2,800,988 against an estimated ten year capital budget of \$2,801,965. Of the total \$2.942 million of recommended improvements, \$2,453,150 million (83.4%) of the improvements are implemented.

For Option C, Table 9-8 identifies those improvements implemented.

**Summary of Capital Improvement Program Options**

Of the three options, Option C provides the greatest level of improvements, while Option A the least. Table 9-7 compares the improvement values of the three Options.

Option	10 Year Improvement Costs and Capital Budgets			
	Capital Budget	Improvement Costs with Inflation	Improvement Costs without Inflation	Improvement Cost without inflation to Total Improvements %
A	\$1,246,350	\$1,236,049	\$1,107,430	37.6%
B	\$1,828,622	\$1,632,835	\$1,556,390	55.5%
C	\$2,801,965	\$2,800,988	\$2,453,150	83.4%

Table 9-7: Comparison of Capital Improvement Program Options

The three options identify a number of conclusions. First, unless the Park District increases its revenues substantially, those recommended improvements which are necessary to maintain a basic level and quality of park land cannot be completed in ten years, but most likely would require 20 years.

Secondly, the Park District cannot implement any new facilities, including the development

Park/Improvement	Improvement Implemented
<b>Bruce Ream Memorial Park</b>	
Park Identification Signs	●
Pedestrian Paths	●
Northeast and South Parking Lots	
Basketball Court	●
Site Furnishings	●
Drinking Fountain	●
Playground	●
Baseball Fields Renovation	●
Softball Field Renovation	●
Soccer Fields	●
Picnic Shelter	●
Restroom Building	●
Electrical/Lighting	●
Landscape	●
Site Master Plan	●
<b>Seyller Park</b>	
Park Identification Signs	●
Pedestrian Paths	●
Northwest and Recreation Building Parking Lots	
Basketball/Tennis Court	●
Site Furnishings	●
Playground	●
Picnic Shelter Renovation	●
Baseball Field Renovation	●
Electrical/Lighting	
Landscape	●
Site Master Plan	●
<b>Community Recreation Center Renovation</b>	
<b>Dorothy J. Schmidt Memorial Park</b>	
Park Identification Signs	●
Pedestrian Paths	●
Site Furnishings	●
Playground	●
Basketball Court	●
Picnic Shelter	●
Landscape	●
Miscellaneous improvements	●
Site Master Plan	●
<b>Tuscany Woods Park Phase II</b>	
Demolition	●
Earthwork	●
Utilities	●
Structure and paving	●
Ballfields	●
Hardscape	●
Landscape	●
Site Furnishings	●

Table 9-8: Option C Improvements Implemented

of new parks which will add almost 250 acres of land over the next ten years.

Until a strategy is developed for increasing capital improvement budgets, the Park District will only be able to implement the level of improvements as identified in Option A, or possible less. The District also needs to establish priorities for recommended improvements, if other proposed facilities are to be implemented.

## Recommendations

### I. FINANCE AND REFERENDUM RECOMMENDATIONS

#### I-A. Prepare a Financial Study/Plan

The Park District should contract for the professional services of a consultant to prepare a Financial Study. This study should at a minimum address:

- Projected existing revenue sources from transition fees, impact fees, and property tax revenues;
- Projected operating and capital improvement budgets;
- Alternative revenues sources;
- Strategy for tax increase and/or bonding authority.

Based upon the financial study and its recommendations, the District should prepare and adopt a 10 year financial plan for the operating and capital improvement budgets which would allow the District to:

- Improve the maintenance of existing recreation facilities;
- Provide an adequate number of staff to operate the maintenance and recreation programs;
- Provide reasonable compensation packages for staff;
- Build and operate a new Community Recreation Center; and
- Develop and maintain recreation facilities in all new parks.

#### I-B. Propose Referendum

In order to meet the goals of the Financial Plan, the Park District should propose a referendum to be voted upon by the District's residents at a general election.

Based upon the needs established in the Financial Study/Plan, the referendum should request resident approval for a property tax increase and/or bonding authority to provide the revenues needed to meet the financial obligations of the District.

#### I-C. Develop a Marketing/Education Strategy for Referendum Approval

To gain voter approval of a tax/bond referendum, the Park District must prepare a marketing and education plan to sell the need and positive benefits of a tax increase. The plan should at least include:

- Identification of benefits to the resident and community;
- How and for what the District will use the additional revenues;
- Brochure describing District's plan;
- Presentation and informational meetings; and
- Support and assistance from affiliate organizations, community service groups, and other volunteer organizations.

Successful passage of a referendum will require the full resources and dedication of the District Board of Commissioners and staff.

## 2. INTER-AGENCY COOPERATION RECOMMENDATIONS

### 2-A. Continue to Develop a Strong Cooperative Relationship with the Village of Hampshire

The Village of Hampshire recently completed a *Comprehensive Land Use Plan* which will serve as the basic guide for future development. Although the Park District encompasses a much greater area than the Village – 36 square miles compared to the Village’s 12 square miles – the Village does have planning jurisdiction (1.5 miles from Village boundary) over most of the area within the Park District boundaries, and most likely, much of this area will eventually be annexed to the Village of Hampshire. Therefore, decisions by the Village relative to development patterns, land uses, and densities will have an impact on the Park District and the development of new parks open space, and programs.

In the Village’s Comprehensive Plan, the Park and Open Space Goal states “to provide for a park and open space system which satisfies the recreational and leisure-time needs of Village residents, and enhances the overall character of the Village.” Further, specific objectives to accomplish this goal were listed.

The above goal and respective objectives of the Village’s Comprehensive Plan clearly identifies a commitment on the part of the Village to maintain a cooperative working relationship with the Park District.

The Park District Board of Commissioners should pursue the development of an on-going schedule of meetings with the Village Board of Trustees. These meetings should lead to the establishment of a joint committee to facilitate

coordinated efforts in the area of planning, review and approval of new developments, subdivision ordinance land dedication, joint use of facilities and equipment, and other cooperative arrangements. In addition, an “annual committee meeting of the whole” should take place between the two Boards.

Prior to the adoption of the Park District’s Comprehensive Park Master Plan, the Park District Board should meet with the Village Board of Trustees and staff to present the District’s Plan, gain the Village’s input, and confirm the Village’s commitment to accomplish the goals and objectives as described in both Plans.

### 2-B. Develop a Cooperative Relationship with Other Surrounding Municipalities

The Village of Hampshire is the only village located within the Park District boundaries, and it has established boundary agreements with most surrounding municipalities. However, several of these municipalities could have future impacts on the Park District relative to new development.

As with the Village of Hampshire, the Park District should pursue the development of an on-going schedule of meetings with the surrounding municipalities. These meetings should lead to the establishment of a joint committee to facilitate coordinated efforts in the area of planning and other cooperative arrangements.

### 2-C. Develop a Cooperative Relationship with the Kane County Forest Preserve District

The Hampshire Township Park District and the Kane County Forest Preserve District have

many functions and programs in common. The Forest Preserve District has done an excellent job of conserving and preserving valuable open space in the County. It has also done a good job providing outdoor recreation, education programs, and activities. The Forest Preserve District presently maintains one preserve within the Park District boundaries – Hampshire Forest Preserve. This preserve contains 276 acres, with additional land planned for acquisition.

The Park District Board should pursue the development of an on-going schedule of meetings with the Kane County Forest Preserve District’s Board. These meetings should lead to the establishment of a joint committee to facilitate coordinated efforts and develop formal agreements in the area of planning, land acquisition, joint use of land, and outdoor recreation programming.

**2-D. Maintain a Cooperative Working Partnership with the Community Unit #300 School District**

The Community Unit #300 School District encompasses the boundaries of the Hampshire Township Park District, plus a sizable service area outside of the Park District. As noted previously, the School District maintains three existing schools on two sites, and two additional sites are proposed. Because students spend a good portion of their days at school, it is logical to expand the recreation facilities at the schools for use during and after school hours and on weekends. For 25% of the year (during the summer), each school facility is under-utilized. As valuable resources of public open space, each school facility should serve as a recreation facility serving the respective neighborhoods.

Currently, there are agreements allowing the

use of facilities at the schools. This should be enhanced to explore the possibility of expansion of recreation facilities at each school. An example of this could be a shared-cost program for installing and maintaining additional recreation facilities at each school. Other examples include shared cost of site maintenance, building maintenance, staffing, and equipment. Each of the schools within Hampshire would greatly benefit if new and/or improved facilities were constructed at each site.

As the School District plans for the potential construction of additional schools in the growing areas of the Park District, the Park District should pursue the possibility of becoming a partner in the implementation of School-Park developments, with the sharing and coordination of playgrounds, athletic fields, gymnasium space, and other recreation-oriented facilities at the new schools.

**2-E. Develop a Cooperative Relationship with Surrounding Park Districts**

There are a number of park districts surrounding the Hampshire Township Park District – including Elgin, Huntley, Belvidere, Genoa, Sycamore, and DeKalb. Each of these districts is unique and different in the populations served and the programs and facilities provided. As in the case with sharing programs and facilities with the school district, similar opportunities exist with these nearby park districts. Developing reciprocal agreements with nearby park districts would allow residents of one district to enroll in another district’s programs at the resident rate. Offering jointly sponsored programs could increase enrollments and make more programs financially feasible.

Park District representatives should meet regularly with representatives of surrounding park

districts to exchange information and ideas, discuss joint opportunities, and coordinate programs and facilities.

### **3. OPERATIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **3-A. Review and Update the Land/Cash Donation Ordinance with Village**

The Park District should meet with the Village to review and update the land/cash donation ordinance.

The present Park District's policy of ten (10) acres of park land per one-thousand (1,000) people proposed to live in a development conforms to the guideline established in this Plan, as well as the Village's standard. The present policy of \$80,000 cash donation in lieu of land is low when compared in terms of present land values. The Village's land value for its public facilities is also \$80,000 per acre; however, the Village's land value for schools is \$110,000. If the District continues its desire to accept land, provided that the land is suitable for recreational uses (not just left-over undeveloped land, or detention basins), the District must gain an agreement with the Village to increase the land value used to determine cash donations. By increasing this value, the District will gain a stronger negotiating position with developers relative to land donations. Also, it is recommended that the value of cash in-lieu of land be updated every 2 years, and adjusted in the Village's ordinance accordingly.

Up to now, the District has primarily chosen to receive land in lieu of cash. With the projected population of over 20,000 and more than 300 acres of park land, the land/population ratio more than meets the standard. As a result, the District needs to evaluate its present policy, and

adjust the level of cash versus land.

#### **3-B. Review and Update School/Park District Agreements**

The Park District and School District should continue to review, revise and update reciprocal use agreements. In reviewing and updating these agreements, it is important that use times, schedules, costs, and responsibilities of both Districts be clearly defined in order to avoid any potential conflicts and to provide equitable sharing of costs.

#### **3-C. Maintenance Staffing**

Presently, there are two part-time individuals performing maintenance operations throughout the year with one additional part-time person employed during the summer. One of the two part-time year-round persons is classified as a maintenance supervisor and generally manages and schedules operations. The District Director oversees the management of maintenance.

With two parks totaling 31 acres, this system has worked satisfactorily, although maintenance staff has not been able to effectively perform all the necessary maintenance operations.

The District will acquire two new park sites within the next year, doubling its acreage to over 62 acres. Within ten years, the District's landholdings will equal at least 300 acres (not including future parks), an increase of over 900%. The capacity to maintain almost 300 acres, as well as implementing site improvements to parks is beyond the limits of the present park maintenance staff. At least one and possibly two full-time maintenance personnel need to be added.

The District needs to reorganize the maintenance of parks into a department on an equal level with the Department of Recreation. A new full-time position of Superintendent of Parks should be created and filled by an individual with a background in planning, design, construction, and maintenance of park facilities. As with the Superintendent of Recreation, the Superintendent of Parks would be a manager and administrator, and would be responsible for developing goals and objectives; establishing facility improvement programs; scheduling operations; assigning and coordinating personnel; and establishing budgets for improvements, operations, and maintenance.

Adding staff or creating new positions may not fully satisfy maintenance needs. With at least two full time and two-part-time year-round staff, additional part-time seasonal staff will most likely be required.

### **3-D. Recreation Program Staffing**

As with the maintenance staff, the recreation program staffing needs to be reviewed and new full-time and part-time staff need to be added as new programs are developed and existing programs expanded. The present recreation program staff of full-time and part-time, with volunteers, has done an excellent job in providing a wide variety of programs to the community. But present staff is stretched in performing all the needed duties in managing and operating programs. As park land continues to be added, programs will also need to be added to meet the growing demand.

The Superintendent of Recreation should evaluate future staff needs to meet expanding programs and establish budgets and a staffing plan.

### **3-E. Staff Job Descriptions**

With reorganization and addition of staff, the District needs to review and update job descriptions for both full-time and part-time staff to clearly define responsibilities, performance criteria, and qualifications for each position. Salaries should be reviewed and pay scales updated to properly equate with qualifications and responsibilities.

### **3-F. Review and Upgrade District Policies and Procedures Manual**

The District needs to review, upgrade, and codify operating policies and procedures. All staff, both full-time and part-time, needs to be aware and understand operating procedures, employee benefits and programs, organizational structure, personnel policies, and grievance procedures.

### **3-G. Staff Training Programs**

As an integral part of upgrading personnel policies and procedures, it is important that the District staff receive adequate training – both in-house and continuing education. The District should establish an annual training plan, which defines policies, procedures, and a budget for all staff training, as well as for commissioners. The plan should have specific objectives and identify actual training experiences. Dedicated funds for training should be included in the District’s annual operating budget. The training should be targeted for both existing and new technical skills, in addition to personal development skills. Customer service skills – both internal and external – need to be upgraded, since all staff has initial and direct contact with the public.

### **3-H. Improve Communications**

As any organization grows, management problems occur, especially in the area of communications. For any organization to operate efficiently and effectively, communications among staff, board, and the public are critical. Although problems do not appear to exist within the District, there is a need to continually evaluate and improve communications.

The District is already employing numerous management techniques to improve communications, and must continue to develop and experiment with new methods/techniques. Annual or semi-annual workshops and/or retreats including staff and commissioners are important to gain input and commitment at all levels of personnel within the District. Employee benefit programs which recognize outstanding service and contribution to the District are a means of improving communications and instilling pride within the organization.

#### **3-I. Evaluation of Program Fees**

The District should review, update, and adopt a comprehensive policy on fees for services. This policy should provide a basis for determining the various levels of fees. Such levels might include: self-sustaining (100% fee supported), semi-core (50% fee supported) and core (free). The policy should be reviewed annually, with individual program fees consistent with policy approved annually.

Related to the policy on fees for services, the District should adopt a “satisfaction guaranteed fee return” policy for its programs. Many park districts have adopted a similar policy, which has resulted in better “feedback” from the public relative to the value and quality of the programs offered. This policy would also go a

long way in demonstrating to the public that the District is committed to serving their needs.

#### **3-J. Evaluation of Rental Fees**

The District should also review, update, and adopt a comprehensive policy on rental fees for the use of facilities. This policy should provide a basis for determining the various levels of rental fees for space and facilities – such as picnic shelters, use of sports fields by organized teams, special events by community organizations, etc. The District’s rental fee policy should be reviewed and updated annually. The policy should define various categories and prioritize those categories in reference to preference for available space and amount of rental fees to be charged.

#### **3-K. Evaluation of Computer System Programs**

Computers are an integral part of the District’s management and administrative systems, and are critical to the staff and the performance of their work. Present computer hardware and its availability to staff are good. The District needs to continually evaluate new technology and software, and upgrade as advancements deem appropriate. In addition, training for staff in new applications and techniques should be an on-going process.

#### **3-L. Develop Facility Management System**

Related to the on-going evaluation and upgrading of computer systems, the District needs to develop a computer system to manage the use and scheduling of its facilities for programs. Presently, the District performs this function on an older computer program. A system that would identify space and schedule program times to the space for up to a period of six months or more would enhance the efficiency,

coordination, and management of space for program needs.

### **3-M. Develop Park Maintenance Management System**

The District will soon maintain almost 65 acres of park land, and will eventually expand to over 300 acres. The ability to effectively and efficiently maintain and manage the land and buildings within the financial resources of the District is and will continue to be a challenge. As the Department of Parks faces the challenge of responding to increased demands with limited resources, it is critical that a Park Maintenance Management System (PMMS) be developed. Components of this system include a comprehensive listing of work tasks, labor distribution of work tasks, work tasks for each park site, and scheduling of work tasks (seasonal, monthly, weekly). Such a system will provide data for developing unit costs, determining standards of service, developing budgets, and determining personnel needs and skills. The system needs to be computerized.

### **3-N. Periodic Updates of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan**

Park and facility plans cannot be static, unchanging documents. While the Comprehensive Park Master Plan looks into the future and projects potential needs and changes, it cannot anticipate all events and developments, which may occur in the intervening years. When properly used, a comprehensive plan must be updated periodically to respond to current and changing conditions in the Park District.

Given the projected increase in residential development in and around the Village of Hampshire, there will be a need for future periodic updates to incorporate development

events and trends, which may occur in the next 5 to 10 years. The Park District should review this Plan annually, and every 2-4 years, it should update the Plan.

In addition, the District shall develop and prioritize goals and objectives each year and review and evaluate annually the progress in accomplishing them. The 10-year Capital Improvement Program should be reviewed, evaluated, and updated annually.

### **3-O. Conduct Attitude/Interest Survey**

At least every five years, the Park District should conduct an attitude/interest survey of its residents. The survey could be conducted with either a questionnaire mailed to residents, or a phone survey sampling the community.

The attitude/interest survey can provide the Park District with an understanding of how residents feel about the District, what existing facilities are used, and the need for new facilities.

## **4. RECREATION PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recommendations for recreation programs are discussed in Chapter 5, and are a part of this list of recommendations.

## **5. PARK LAND DONATION/ ACQUISITION RECOMMENDATIONS**

With the donation to the Park District of land from proposed developments, over 275 acres will be added to the existing 34 acres. In addition, there is approximately 74 acres of potential donated land from future develop-

ments. With the potential for this acreage, the Park District is in a unique position of not having to acquire outright new land for parks.

The following recommendations document the acquisition of land through the donation process. In addition, there are several sites that should be added in order to meet the service area standards for both neighborhood and community parks.

**5-A. Expansion of Bruce Ream Memorial Park**

The Park District has indicated that land adjacent to Bruce Ream Memorial Park, along the west boundary, may be available to be added to the Park District. The property contains 15.13 acres, and with the existing 13.97 acres, the Park will expand to 29.10 acres.

The property is flat with a waterway crossing the southwest corner of the site. As a result of the waterway, the entire property is located within both the 100 year and 500 year flood plains. In addition, there is a floodway located along the waterway. Both the floodway and flood plains do restrict the type and extent of development and improvements.

Although there are restrictions due to the floodplains and floodways, the potential for recreation facilities exist, such as athletic fields, court facilities, and trails. The preparation of a Site Master Plan for the Park should include this property.

The time schedule for obtaining this property is unknown, but the District should actively continue to pursue its acquisition under the land donation ordinance.

**5-B. Park Donations of Proposed Developments**

As part of the Village’s land/cash donation program, the Park District will receive 8 sites totaling 245.14 acres (including the Bruce Ream Memorial Park expansion site). As soon as the land is properly prepared by developers, the Park District should take ownership and bank the land until it can be developed

PROPOSE DONATED PARK LANDS	
Prairie Ridge Community 12	12.25 ac.
Prairie Ridge Community 14	39.40 ac.
Prairie Ridge Community 16	27.75 ac.
Prairie Ridge Community 17	28.89 ac.
Oakstead Community 24	91.70 ac.
Tuscany Woods Park	28.40 ac.
Tamms Park	1.62 ac.
Ream Park Land Addition	15.13 ac.
<b>Total Proposed Park District Parks</b>	<b>245.14 ac.</b>

Table 9-9: Proposed Donated Park Land to the Park District

**5-C. Private Park Donation Sites**

In the service area analysis for neighborhood parks (see Chapter 4), four areas were identified lacking neighborhood service areas. Two of these areas are located in the proposed Prairie Ridge development and two areas are located in the Oakstead development. In both of these developments, there are numerous private parks proposed. In accordance with the development agreements, the Village and the Park District have the option to take ownership of any of these proposed private park sites.

It is recommended that the Park District obtain ownership of 3 of these parks, which include the following:

Prairie Ridge:	Park 8	3.95 ac.
Oakstead:	Park 1	6.36 ac.
<u>Oakstead:</u>	<u>Park 7</u>	<u>2.06 ac.</u>
Total Acreage:		12.37 ac.

be involved throughout the planning development process in order to assure that the District's needs are met.

**5-D. Brier Hill Crossings Development Park Donation**

Within the proposed Brier Hill Crossings development, there will be 560 residential units with a potential population of over 1,700 people. There is no neighborhood or community park land provided in this development and since it lies north of US Route 20 (an arterial roadway), access to park land south is undesirable.

It is recommended that the Park District meet with Village staff and the developer to gain ownership of at least 17 acres of park land to satisfy both neighborhood and community park needs.

**5-E. Requirements and Standards for Donated Park Land**

Prior to accepting park land from developers as part of the land/cash donation program, the Park District shall require developers to meet specific requirements and standards. These requirements and standards, which are based on Park District documents, are described in Appendix B.

The requirements and standards provide the Park District with the tools to negotiate with prospective developers for future park sites that will meet the needs of the District. The District should review these requirements and standards with the Village and make developers aware of the requirements and standards at the beginning of the planning development process. Representatives of the Park District should

**6. LAND AND FACILITY RECOMMENDATIONS**

**6-A. Prepare Site Survey Plans for Current Parks**

Except for an old and outdated plat of survey for Bruce Ream Memorial Park, the District has no current survey plans for both Bruce Ream Memorial Park and Seyller Park. The District needs to know what conditions exist at each park for planning, maintenance and improvement purposes. Survey plans identifying at a minimum property boundaries, easements, existing utilities, structures, contours (elevations), vegetation, paths, parking lots, and recreation facilities will provide the District with the necessary documentation. Site surveys of existing conditions will be necessary in the preparation of Site Master Plans as well as construction design documents for implementation of recommended improvements.

**6-B. Prepare Site Master Plans for Current and Proposed Parks**

The Park District should develop a Site Master Plan for each of its current and proposed park sites. These Site Master Plans should indicate current uses, conditions of the facilities and equipment, and the development of proposed improvements. Once established, these Site Master Plans form the basis for developing and evaluating implementation plans and annually budgeting improvements. In addition, Site Master Plans for pedestrian/bicycle trail system should be prepared.

The development of each park Site Master Plan should entail a planning process that at least includes: (1) site survey and analysis, (2) facilities program development and analysis, (3) development of conceptual alternatives, (4) development of a final master plan and cost estimate, and (5) development of a phasing plan.

Critical throughout this planning process is the review and input from District's residents. In the development of Site Master Plans for neighborhood parks, residents residing within at least the service area of the park should be involved. Where community parks are being planned, residents within the entire District should be involved. Public participation can take a number of forms or a combination, including input and review meetings, questionnaires, design charettes, etc. When the public is involved in the planning of parks, they take pride and ownership in the park(s).

### **6-C. Space Requirements for Recreation Facilities**

Issues have been raised about the space requirements for various athletic facilities, such as ball fields, soccer fields, etc. It is important that in the design of recreation facilities, the proper spatial dimensions be provided to safely accommodate the facility. In addition to the space requirements for the active field areas, adequate space should be provided around the facility to minimize conflicts with other facilities and activities. Safety for park users is essential, and space standards should be employed to provide the optimum safe use of the park.

Appendix C in this Plan illustrates accepted space standards and requirements for recreation facilities.

### **6-D. Playground Design and Renovation**

Playgrounds are an important and highly used recreational facility in the community. They are one of the few facilities found in several classifications of parks.

In the Park District, there are a total of two playgrounds, not including one located on the elementary school site. The playground in Seyller Park was constructed within the last five years, while the playground in Bruce Ream Memorial Park is older than 15 years and needs complete renovation.

The life cycle of a playground is approximately 15 years before wear and tear, due to use, warrants replacement. The Park District should adopt a fifteen-year renovation cycle for all playgrounds.

Playgrounds should be designed utilizing the latest standards and guidelines for safety and accessibility. Accessibility in conformance with ADA is the law, whereas, compliance with CPSC are only recommended guidelines. However, the safety guidelines have become the minimal standards adopted by almost all the major playground manufacturers, and should be adopted by the Park District.

In the planning and design of playgrounds, the following should be considered:

1. Neighborhood residents should be involved in the planning and design process by conducting public meetings and workshops, and gaining input, suggestions and ideas for playground equipment.
2. Not all playgrounds in the community should be the same or look alike. Playgrounds can be designed to provide unique or different experiences for children.

3. Playground equipment should be designed to provide challenging experiences for all age groups.
4. Playgrounds should be designed not only to include development of physical skills, but also social and cognitive learning experiences.
5. Seating areas with benches and tables should be provided in playground areas for parents, and the opportunity for children to rest and relax.
6. Trees should be incorporated in and around playgrounds to provide shade during the summer months.
7. The Park District should have one staff personnel who is certified by the Playground Safety Institute to inspect and maintain playground safety. The Park District should institute a playground safety program, which establishes minimum inspection procedures, schedules, and maintenance repairs.

#### **6-E. Maximize Quality of Athletic Fields**

The quality and condition of athletic fields is important for the safe use by both players and spectators. Almost all the athletic fields are heavily used, and in many instances, the fields are used for more than one sport. As a result, the fields do not have sufficient time to “recover” from the intense use. When fields are not used for games, many of them are used for practice, which furthers their deterioration.

One solution would be to limit use of the fields by sports organizations. Reducing the number of games and the length of their playing season could allow time for the fields to recover. Another solution would be to increase the number of fields and rotate use to permit each field time to recover. Either of these options appears very unlikely based upon the high de-

mand and availability of space for additional athletic fields.

The ability of improving fields is a combination of options. First, use of fields may have to be limited or controlled. Without the possibility of adding new fields in the near future, the existing fields cannot be used all the time. Use of fields by several sports during the year should be limited. Secondly, physical improvements need to be implemented. These may include:

- Many of the existing fields are extremely level, and do not permit adequate surface drainage. Fields need to be re-graded to provide adequate slope for surface water to drain, rather than pond on the fields.
- Intensive use athletic fields need to be irrigated. Irrigation will enhance growing conditions during hot, dry periods.
- Many fields will require the installation of subsurface drainage systems (drain tiles), which will reduce the level of excessive soil moisture, and improve drainage conditions. This is especially the case at Bruce Ream Memorial Park, where the fields are all located within the 100 and 500 year flood plains, and are occasionally under water during the spring season.
- A turf maintenance program should be instituted which includes annual soil aeration, fertilization, seeding, and insect/disease control

Some athletic fields may simply consist of poor soils, such as clay, which does not properly drain, and is easily compacted causing poor conditions for turf and hard surfaces for players. Where poor soil conditions are evident, fields should be re-graded, tilled, and topsoil added (as well as other soil additives) to improve drainage and turf conditions. It is recommended that soil tests be conducted on athletic fields to determine the quality and physical characteristics of the soils. The soil

tests can assist in establishing a renovation program for each field.

### 6-F. Park Landscape

Seyller Park and Bruce Ream Memorial Park are old parks. Seyller Park has a mature stand of oak trees which enhances the park and creates a pleasant landscape character. By contrast, Bruce Ream Memorial Park contains few mature trees, except along the boundaries, where numerous large evergreens exist.

Planting of new landscape materials has been instituted in the parks, but not very aggressively. In the preparation of Site Master Plans for each park, landscape development will be a key element of the plans. A planned and phased planting program of new trees and shrubs will (1) accommodate existing and proposed use activity areas, (2) replace aging and damaged plants, (3) improve and maintain a park-lake character, and (4) create a pleasant and usable environment for park users.

Recommended improvements in each of the parks have incorporated landscape development. Approximately 10% of the total Capital Improvement Plan Budget has been recommended for landscape development.

Recommendations for park landscape include the following:

- A landscape plant material inventory of each park should be conducted. The inventory, using the site surveys recommended above, should identify all plants, species, and conditions. The inventory will assist in identifying annual planting programs and future needs.
- Landscape plantings should utilize native plants that are indigenous to the region and local conditions. Use of non-native and/or exotic plants should be avoided,

since they may require greater maintenance and be more susceptible to diseases and insects.

- Landscape plantings in parks should encompass a diversity of plant species, especially trees and shrubs. Too many of one plant specie can be dangerous if there is a disease or insect infestation.
- An aggressive tree maintenance program should be instituted in all parks. Trees and shrubs should be regularly pruned to maintain healthy conditions and minimize damage from wind.

## 7. NEW FACILITY RECOMMENDATIONS

### 7-A. New Community Recreation Center Building

During the public meeting and workshop, almost all participants expressed the need for a new Community Recreation Center. Even the Village's Comprehensive Plan stated as one of their objectives for parks and recreation the need for the development of a new community recreation center. Presently, the Park District's existing Community Recreation Center (5,000 square feet) provides space for administrative functions and recreation programs. The space and available square footage is inadequate to meet present needs and seriously limits the number and types of recreation programs and activities. Through cooperative agreements with the School District, the Park District has utilized all three school buildings for many of its programs. However, with limited control over school space for scheduling and use, the flexibility and capability to expand programs is extremely restricted in meeting the recreation needs of the community.

In comparison to many other communities with recreation centers, the Hampshire Township Park District is large enough to support such a facility, especially with the projected growth in population over the next ten years. For instance, Northfield Park District, with a population of 4,000 developed a community recreation center as a joint venture project with the Village and School District. The community center is located adjacent to a middle school where both share the gymnasium. In addition, the building contains two multi-purpose activity rooms, restrooms, administrative offices, and a fitness center.

Another unique example is Glenview Park District's "Park Central" mega-recreation center. Developed as a joint facility with Evanston Northwestern Hospital, the new facility provides health fitness programs, senior center, indoor pool, and numerous crafts and activities rooms. Containing approximately 100,000 square feet, the Park District serves a population of 41,000.

Over the past ten years, many park and recreational agencies have developed community recreation centers, indicating a strong trend and demand for indoor recreation activities. As discussed earlier, there has also been an apparent trend in mega-recreation centers. However, early indications are that some of these large centers are experiencing financial problems. As indicated above, the size of community has not been a determining factor as to the feasibility of such a facility. Also, park agencies have employed a number of creative partnerships to develop such facilities.

In 1999, the Hampshire Township Park District commissioned Burnidge Cassell Associates to prepare a Feasibility Study for a new Recreation Center. The study included a market study, opinion poll survey, community input meetings, development of a building program,

four alternatives with costs, site location analysis, and final concept plan and cost estimate.

The market study indicated that with the projected increase in population and median income of District residents, these trends support and will continue to create the demand for increased recreation programs and facilities. The opinion poll survey supported the construction of a recreation center by a margin of 71.1% in favor.

The study's site location analysis concluded that the most suitable location would be the area northwest of the existing building. The proposed and existing buildings would be connected, and the existing building would continue to be used for recreation programs. This location would limit future expansion of the building.

The four building alternatives investigated included gross square footages of 19,565 square feet, 26,278 square feet, 28,398 square feet, and 35,111 square feet. The final concept plan recommended a building with 30,650 square feet, including the 5,000 square feet of the existing building. The uses and space for the proposed building included the following:

<u>Space</u>	<u>Square Feet</u>
Gymnasium - 2 basketball courts	10,916
Fitness Center	2,800
Aerobics	2,000
Multi-purpose Rooms	2,100
Jogging Track	2,492
Locker Rooms	2,000
Lobby/Vestibule	800
Office/Control Desk	800
Storage	1,300
Maintenance/Janitor Closets	200
Restrooms	400
Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing	1,600
<u>Unassigned Space</u>	<u>3,242</u>
Total Gross Square Footage	30,650

The estimated cost for the proposed building ranged between \$4,363,552 and \$4,831,621. Based on 2005 dollars, the range would be approximately \$5,200,000 to \$5,800,000. Based on the 1999 Feasibility Study, the Park District in April of 2000 conducted a referendum to raise bonds for the building and other improvements. Although residents were overwhelmingly in favor of a new Community Recreation Center building, they were against raising taxes.

With the population and need continuing to rapidly grow, it is recommended that the Park District revisit the 1999 Feasibility Study. The study should be updated with a new user opinion survey poll and community meetings. Combined with a District Financial Study as recommended above, the District should develop a strategy for gaining approval of a tax increase. As part of the building feasibility study, the District should explore partnership options. For instance, since the Library District covers the same boundary area as the Park District, and the Library has no room for expansion in the downtown, the potential for a joint facility could exist. Joint classroom space and meeting rooms may be of interest to the library, the village or the school district.

The plan developed for a community recreation center should accommodate existing programs and also allow for the growth of programs in sports, the arts and health, and fitness. It may be desirable to plan a facility that could be constructed in phases. The District should also be careful to plan a facility that does not solely rely on revenue from the facility to cover all the operating costs. In this way the costs of construction, maintenance and operation can increase incrementally as revenues increase with population and development increase. Due to the dynamic growth of the township, the Park District should not rely on

the revenue generated from this facility to always cover all operating costs.

In the 1999 Feasibility Study, options for the location of a new building were extremely limited. Today, with a number of proposed parks being donated to the District, a number of options exist. These include:

Seyller Park

- Sufficient space available in the eastern portion of the park (new land)
- Would result in negative impact on residential areas with traffic to the center
- Potential negative impact on adjacent residences

Bruce Ream Memorial Park

- Most of the park in 100 and 500 year flood plains - would restrict building
- Require elimination of recreation facilities and athletic field(s)
- Would result in negative impact on residential areas with traffic to the center
- Potential negative impact on adjacent residences

Propose Community Park #16

- Available undeveloped land
- Located near existing downtown
- Located adjacent to proposed Village Center/Hall
- Centrally located in the community
- Located on proposed rural collector street
- Adjacent to proposed Open Space/Greenways

Proposed Community Park #17

- Available undeveloped land
- Centrally located in the community
- Located on proposed local collector street and near rural collector street
- Adjacent to proposed Open Space/Greenways

## 7-B. Skateboard Park

There is a trend throughout the country and region over the past ten years to create appropriate environments for skating. Despite prohibitions, skaters continue to use stairways, parking ramps, and park equipment because there are no alternatives provided. Park and Recreation agencies have been analyzing this problem, and in recent years, a number of park districts have constructed skateboard parks.

During the public meeting, the need for a skateboard facility in Hampshire was expressed. A review of the issues frequently cited in conjunction with skateboard parks such as injuries, insurance, noise, space, and costs indicate that this activity is comparable to other current activities provided for in the Park District, such as soccer and football. Moreover, a skateboard park is seen to serve the needs of a broader range of pre-teens and teens.

There are generally two major issues in developing a skateboard park. These include (1) the type and cost, and (2) the location.

Generally, there are two types of skateboard parks. The first is constructed of concrete and is usually depressed in the ground. The concrete is formed to provide a wide range of elements and challenges to the skaters. This type of facility generally ranges in cost from \$250,000 to over \$500,000.

The second design type of skateboard park is a level paved area, either concrete or asphalt, on which are constructed or manufactured components, such as take-off ramps, rails, quarter pipes, half pipes, etc. With this type, the components can be moved, added or removed, and modified over time. Also, should the park not be successful, the paved area can be converted to another use, such as a basketball court or tennis court. This type generally ranges in costs

from \$75,000 to \$150,000. It is recommended that the second design type be constructed in Hampshire because of its costs and flexibility.

The most difficult and controversial issue is where to locate a skateboard park. There are a number of factors to consider, including:

- A central location within the community for accessibility of users.
- Availability of space in the park without the loss of existing facility(s). Skateboard parks can vary in size from 5,000 to 15,000 square feet.
- Available parking and drop-off for parents driving users to the facility. Normally, not much parking is needed, and if the park has existing parking, there can be a sharing to accommodate needs.
- Distance to nearby residential homes should be maximized or adequate screening should be provided to minimize the noise objection from neighboring residents.
- The park should be accessible to walks and bike trail within the community.
- The skateboard park should be compatible with other recreation facilities in the park.

Unless the Park District was able to acquire a site, the only potential locations are in the two existing parks. Bruce Ream Memorial Park has inherent problems due to the extent of the flood plains, where it would be restricted. The only area out of the flood plain is along the eastern boundary, where facilities exist and residents are located nearby. In Seyller Park, the topography, existing trees, and existing facilities limit available potential locations. However, two possible locations need to be further analyzed. These include the former outdoor ice skating area and the existing basketball/tennis courts if they were relocated.

The feasibility of locating a skateboard park in either park or a proposed park, further empha-

sizes the need to develop Site Master Plans for existing and proposed parks as recommended above.

### **7-C. Golf Course**

There are no golf courses existing in the Park District boundaries. However, within Kane County and the surrounding Counties (Boone, McHenry, DuPage, Kendall and DeKalb) there are over 75 golf courses.

Land required for a full length 18-hole course is a minimum of 130 acres. Construction costs usually range from \$5 to \$8 million. As noted earlier, golf courses with a complement of related facilities can be a good revenue producer.

With the large land area required, high initial capital expenditures, and somewhat recent questionable trends, the feasibility for the Park District to invest in the development of a golf course within the next ten years is very questionable. In addition, there are higher priorities for capital improvements in existing and proposed parks.

### **7-D. Golf Learning Center**

As discussed in an earlier chapter, there has been a positive trend in the region for the development of golf learning centers.

This facility requires less acreage, usually 50 to 60 acres, with a capital expenditure of between \$3 and \$5 million. Because of its regional market area requirement, a desirable location for this facility would be along the Tollway, which would provide high visibility and good accessibility.

As with a golf course, the Park District cannot afford the capital expenditures for a golf learning center within the next ten years. Because of limited financial resources, there are higher

priorities for capital improvements in existing and proposed parks.

### **7-E. Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail System**

As discussed in Chapter 8, a pedestrian/bicycle trail system should be developed as part of the Open Space System. The Park and Open Space Master Plan suggest a pedestrian/bicycle system that links community facilities, such as parks, schools, and downtown area, with existing and proposed residential neighborhoods.

The Park District should establish a working committee with the Village, county, and adjacent communities to begin the planning and implementation of this facility.

### **7-F. Natural Areas and Nature Center**

The Park and Open Space Master Plan discussed in Chapter 8, identifies a system of Open Space to link facilities in the township and to protect and conserve natural resources. Within this Open Space system there will be numerous natural areas for the protection of native flora and fauna. These areas will provide opportunities for educational/environmental programs, as well as bird-watching, nature trails, etc. The responsibilities for managing these areas are discussed in Chapter 8, and the Park District should take a leadership role in this management and ownership.

With the potential for 100's of acres of natural areas, the Park District needs to capitalize on this resource with the development of a nature center to provide educational and environmental awareness programs. The development of this facility could be accomplished as a joint or cooperative arrangement with the Forest Preserve District and/or environmental organizations. Acquisition and renovation of an

existing structure, such as an old barn historical to the area, could provide a unique facility for this purpose.

In conjunction with implementing and managing the Open Space systems, the Park District should investigate the feasibility of such a facility.

### **7-G. Water Facilities for Fishing**

In the discussion of trends, fishing was one of several popular activities participated in by large numbers of people. It was also an activity mentioned during the public input meeting.

With the extent of new and proposed developments and the strict requirement for providing storm-water management facilities, this would be an excellent opportunity to develop a “fishing hole” in conjunction with a wet basin facility. It is recommended that the Park District investigate this type of facility with developers.

## **8. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **8-A. Access for Special Populations to Recreation Programs and Facilities**

With the Park District’s membership in the Northern Illinois Special Recreation Association (NISRA), the Park District is committed to providing access for special populations to programs, activities and facilities in compliance with the American with Disabilities Act. The District should continue to evaluate its policies and formulate procedures for compliance in meeting the needs of special populations.

NISRA should be asked to provide staff training not only for ADA issues in general, but specifically about registrants into Park District recreation programs and facilities to provide smooth inclusion experiences.

### **8-B. Establish a Citizen Advisory Committee**

The Board and staff need “to know” their community. One of the best ways to do this is through the development of a citizen advisory committee. This group can review staff program recommendations. It can also conduct neighborhood and community meetings to receive citizen input. The committee members should be as representative of the community as possible. A variety of views and interests should be present. While a citizen advisory committee takes an additional commitment by the Board and staff it is worth the effort. A six to nine person advisory committee could be a great asset to the Hampshire Township Park District.

In addition, if there is identity or public awareness needs, the advisory committee could assist the District with public information through both formal and informal channels. Finally, members of the Citizen Advisory Committee can be looked upon as an excellent source of candidates for the Park District Board of Commissioners.

### **8-C. Establish a “Friends of the Park” Volunteer Program**

Many park districts in the state have a “Friends of the Park” program, which enables various groups and individuals to volunteer time for the benefit of the Park District’s programs and facilities. This program can help augment the paid Park District staff and perform many activities, which could not be afforded within the Park District fiscal budget. Such organizations

are known to install and maintain playgrounds and other recreation equipment, organize and help with special events and festivals, assist with newsletters, and serve as volunteer staff in many recreation programs.

The Park District already utilizes volunteers to assist with recreation programs. These individuals perform a critical service, and their time and effort is greatly appreciated by the Park District. Similar use of volunteers could be employed as “park stewards” for all the park sites.

It is recommended that the Park District develop such a program and prepare an inventory of areas where volunteers could be used. This information should be put into a pamphlet and distributed to local groups, service and civic organizations, and churches. The Park District should designate a staff position to serve as a coordinator of volunteer programs.

#### **8-D. Establish a Park Foundation**

The Park District should investigate the feasibility of establishing a non-profit foundation. Many park districts in the state have established foundations for the primary purposes of (1) acquiring and selling land (2) accepting gifts and donations, and (3) raising funds for the renovation of park facilities. The foundation would be a separate entity from the Park District, and the Board of Commissioners could be comprised of one or two Park District Commissioners and individuals from the community, such as business leaders, community organization leaders, and other public officials. The foundation would have greater flexibility in acquiring and selling land, holding land, and then conveying the land to the Park District.

The secret to the success of this type of organization is leadership ~ finding someone in the community who strongly believes in improving park facilities and is dedicated to this goal.

Given the magnitude of improvements outlined in this Plan, a park foundation may be critical to achieving the park system envisioned by the Park District in this Comprehensive Park Master Plan.

#### **8-E. Develop Memorial/Gifts Donation Program**

Many park districts raise funds for park improvements through special commemorative gift or donation programs. The Park District should actively encourage the donation of monetary gifts from individuals, businesses, corporations, and foundations.

This program could include the use of cash donations to pay for specific improvements in parks, such as playgrounds, trees, paths, site amenities, etc. Costs for key improvements can be identified, and a donation sought from both individuals and corporations.

Acknowledgment of a donation can take a number of different forms, depending on the magnitude of the donation and the policies established by the Park District. In many cases, recognition through the newsletter and/or on a plaque at the Park District Headquarters is sufficient. In some instances, a plaque or other acknowledgment may be placed near the donated facility. This type of program works well for landscape improvements, such as, benches, bricks, and other items, which can be sold for relatively low dollar amounts.

The Park District should also encourage the donation of lands by private individuals. While land would be donated as living legacies of the donors, they may also earn the donors

substantial tax savings.

The District should develop a program for such land and cash donations and prepare a brochure that describes the benefits of such gifts and a listing of what donations can be used for in the parks.

**8-F. Explore a Corporate Sponsorship/Advertising Program**

Numerous park districts are investigating and others have adopted Corporate Sponsor Advertising programs. Some districts have gone to the extent of adopting official products. Others have adopted policies for corporate advertising for publications, scoreboards, advertising on field fencing, and others techniques. The Park District should investigate such programs and policies, but, if done, should be done with “taste” and restraint.

**8-G. Market the Park District to the Public**

The Park District needs to market itself, its facilities, and programs to the community. Public relations are critical to the District. Residents must be aware of what the Park District is doing for them, how their tax-dollars are benefiting them, and why they must support the programs and activities of the Park District. It is also a means of expressing personal pride and character in the Park District.

Public relations and marketing for the Park District can take many forms. One facet of this effort would be to upgrade the image the Park District portrays to the community and to reinforce its professional organization. As an example, the District needs to graphically upgrade its signage system. Improving this image is apparent in the absence of a coordinated, and in some instances, a unified signage system

among the parks and within the parks.

The Park District has done an excellent job in publishing its brochures and informational publications, and should continue to improve the appearance of such materials. This is an area where initially volunteers with expertise in the advertising, design, and desktop publishing fields might offer assistance. The District should maintain an active file of other park district publications for use in obtaining graphic design ideas for its own publications.

Marketing of the Park District’s programs and activities is important, and the District should evaluate the future potential in creating a position, initially part-time, for an individual with marketing expertise. Numerous park districts in the state who have employed a public relations person have realized the financial return and benefits of such a position. It may be possible to share such a position with other agencies in the community, for instance, the school district and community organizations.

## Implementation

To achieve the park system envisioned in the preceding Chapters, the Hampshire Township Park District will have to make numerous decisions and take action steps. With the limited resources and current financial restraints, it would be impossible to implement all the recommendations described in the previous sections. Some efforts will require direct capital expenditure, while other efforts will require planning and cooperation with other agencies and organizations.

It is recommended that action steps be divided into three levels. The first level is critical actions that the Park District should take to address its core needs and improve upon its strengths. This level also addresses the needs to deal with the projected increase in population and the significant expansion of park land.

The second level, although no less important than the first, deals with immediate issues, but will take time to address. The third level is longer term recommendations and future facilities. The action steps identified in each level do not address all the recommendations, and it will be essential that the Park District establish priorities to the recommendations, and evaluate priorities annually.

### CRITICAL ACTION STEPS

The following steps outline actions the Park District should undertake now and address over the next six to twelve months. Steps are not listed in any particular order.

- Contract for the preparation of a financial study and plan to address projected revenues, budgets, capital improvements, and methods to increase needed revenues.

- Establish a strategy to gain referendum approval for an increase in the tax rate and/or bonding authority. This strategy should include a strong education and marketing plan.
- On an interim bases, rent space for the Park District administrative headquarters and additional recreation program space.
- Contract for the feasibility study of a new Community Recreation Building, including costs and phasing options.
- Review and prioritize the recommended improvements. This task should be assigned to the Long-Range Planning Committee and reviewed and approved by the Board of Commissioners.
- Renovate the existing Community Recreation Center to accommodate the pre-school programs.

### IMMEDIATE ACTION STEPS

The following steps outline actions the Park District should address over the next twelve to thirty-six months. Steps are not listed in any particular order.

- Prepare Site Master Plans for the three existing parks
- Apply for an OSLAD development grant for the implementation of recommended improvements in either Tuscan Woods Park Phase II or Dorothy J. Schmidt Memorial Park
- Implement recommended improvements if the OSLAD grant is approved.

- Expand administrative, recreation and maintenance staff and compensate for experience and performance.
  - Establish a “Friends of the Parks” program to assist the Park District in programs, activities, and special events. This program can also assist in the passage of a referendum.
  - Establish a Citizen Advisory Committee to assist the Park District with evaluating its programs, facilities, activities, and strategy for increasing revenues.
  - Establish a non-profit Park Foundation to accept gifts and donations, raise funds, and accept land donations.
  - Institute an annual public meeting and utilize focus groups to gain input, suggestions, and comments from Park District residents.
  - Reorganize the maintenance operations into a Department of Parks and hire a full-time Superintendent of Parks.
- agreements and sharing of recreational facilities and programs.
  - Prepare OSLAD Grant for either Tuscan Woods Park Phase II or Dorothy J. Schmidt Memorial Park.
  - Continue meeting and cooperating with School District 300 in the joint use of recreation facilities and the future development of the two new school sites.
  - Meet annually with the Affiliate Sports organizations and groups in the community to understand needs and pursue joint working arrangements in the development of recreation facilities.
  - Widely publish the annual goals so the residents of the Park District, as well as the Board of Commissioners, hold the administrators accountable for quality results.
  - Establish a marketing plan and program for recreation programs, activities, and events.
  - Review and update this Comprehensive Park Master Plan every two to four years.

### LONG RANGE ACTION STEPS

- Host meeting with Kane County Forest Preserve District, Kane County Planning Department, Village of Hampshire, and other surrounding townships/municipalities to discuss and promote the development of a pedestrian/bicycle trail system.
- Conduct focus group sessions with senior citizens and teens to evaluate program and facility needs and alternatives.
- Meet with neighboring park districts to discuss opportunities for joint cooperative

## Alternative Funding Sources

The following discussion identifies some of the major sources the Park District can utilize to fund improvements to the park system.

### GENERAL REVENUE

The simplest funding mechanism is to allocate funds from general revenue sources. However, capital improvements within the park system are often considered a low priority in comparison to other items funded through general revenue, such as maintenance, staffing, and programming. With the local concern over property taxes, increased funding for capital improvements from general revenue will need to be aggressively explored.

### BONDS

The Park District can issue bonds to fund capital improvements to the park system. Depending on the type of bond used and the amount of the bond, voter approval may be required. Park District taxpayers have rejected bond referendums three times in the past 10 years, and may not be anxious to vote for an additional tax increase to fund park improvements or acquisitions in the near future.

### USER FEES

The Park District can and does assess fees for use of facilities and registration for programs. However, revenue collected from user fees for certain facilities may not be adequate. Even under good conditions, market rate user fees do not cover operating costs for many facilities and programs.

For some high-demand programs and activities, the Park District may be able to charge a market-based fee that exceeds actual operating costs. The revenue surplus could be applied to other Park District accounts to cover operating losses in other programs or to maintain and improve other facilities.

One of the Affiliate organizations that use the Park District recreation facilities needs to assist in the renovation and development of those facilities, such as ball fields. The Park District should study a user fee program for these organizations.

### OSLAD/LWCF GRANTS

The State of Illinois Open Space Land Acquisition and Development (OSLAD) grant program, and the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grant program are both administered by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. Both programs provide a 50/50 cost sharing for park acquisition and development. Both programs are highly competitive, with only about one-half of total funds requested actually being granted. The State's OSLAD program is funded through a percentage of the Real Estate Transfer Tax.

Over \$20 million in funding is available annually to Illinois communities, park districts, and forest preserves. Maximum reimbursement for approved development projects is \$400,000. Natural areas and high recreational value projects are a high priority for funding through this program.

### ILLINOIS BICYCLE PATH GRANT PROGRAM

Funded through a percentage of vehicle title registration fees, this program provides up to

50% funding assistance for acquisition and development of bike paths. Development projects are limited to \$200,000 per request, with no limit placed on acquisition projects.

The program encourages submission of plans that provide regional bikeway opportunities. This suggests potential for matching funds for proposed trails along Greenways and the connection to established regional bikeways in the surrounding communities. Coordination with the neighboring communities and Forest Preserve District will provide the best opportunity for receiving funding under this program.

### **T-21 (Formerly ISTEA)**

This federal program, called the Intermodal Surface Transportation Enhancement Act (ISTEA), requires that 10 percent of all Surface Transportation Funds must be used for "transportation enhancements." Enhancements include 10 specific activities. Those activities related to park and recreation improvements include development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites, and landscaping. Funds available for this program have been significant. However, most of the funds allocated to Illinois have been assigned to local projects. Additional federal funds are possible, but have not yet been appropriated. A 20 percent local match is required to receive funding under this program.

### **CORPORATE SUPPORT**

As discussed in the previous section, corporations will donate funds for the construction of specific improvements. With the proposed development of the Brier Hill Crossings business park and the relocation of a number of

corporate offices along the Tollway, the potential exists to tap this resource.

### **CORPORATE SPONSORSHIPS AND ADVERTISING**

Again, as discussed in the previous section, the establishment of a Corporate Sponsor/Advertising program could yield funding for new facilities and the improvement of existing facilities.

### **COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS**

Groups such as Rotary, Lions and Jaycees often support community-oriented projects such as park improvements. It is best to approach these groups with a specific, identifiable project, such as a playground or picnic shelter.

### **PARK FOUNDATION**

As discussed in the previous section, a non-profit Park Foundation can raise funds for park improvements.

### **MEMORIAL GIFT/DONATIONS**

If established by the Park District, a memorial gift/donation program can raise funds for new facilities and improvements to existing facilities as discussed in the previous section.

